

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Riley during the May 2, 2011 telephone interview. The reasons warranting favorable action discussed during the interview are incorporated into the following remarks and constitute Applicants' separate record of the interview.

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 4 and 11 being the only independent claims. By this Amendment, the independent claims are amended as discussed during the interview to make explicit that which was implicit. No new matter is added.

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-8, 10-15 and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on U.S. Patent No. 6,130,757 to Yoshida et al. ("Yoshida") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0103777 A1 to Nakamura et al. ("Nakamura"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,259,876 to Obata et al. ("Obata"). In addition, the Office Action rejects Claims 9 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Yoshida in view of Nakamura and Obata, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,934,046 to Nishikawa et al. ("Nishikawa"). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites a data processing apparatus comprising one or more compression/decompression units that compress the data for an input job and decompress the compressed data, and a controller. When a processing request is issued for processing of the data for a next job by the compression/decompression unit(s) during processing of the data for a current job by the compression/decompression unit(s), the controller performs processing comprising: a) obtaining

the processing wait period between individual pages of the current job, b) obtaining the minimum processing time for the next job data, c) comparing the processing wait period between individual pages of the current job with the minimum processing time for the next job data, d) determining whether or not the processing wait period is longer than the minimum processing time, based on a comparison between the minimum processing time for the next job data and the processing wait period, and e) controlling the execution of processing of data for the next job by the compression/ decompression unit(s) in accordance with this determination.

Independent Claim 11 defines a data processing apparatus including similar features.

As discussed during the interview, some benefits of the claimed data processing apparatus are discussed in paragraphs [0019] and [0020] of the published U.S. application. As discussed in paragraph [0019], if the processing wait period between pages of the current job is longer than the minimum processing time for the next-job data, at least minimal processing of the next-job data can be performed during the processing wait period for the current job, and therefore next-job processing is carried out between pages of the current job. Conversely, if the processing wait period between pages of the current job is shorter than the minimum processing time for the next-job data, processing of the current job would be delayed by the execution of processing of the next-job data during the processing wait period for the current job. Therefore next-job processing is put on hold. In addition, and as explained in paragraph [0020] of the published U.S. application, because next-job processing is conducted only so long as there is no effect on current job processing as described above, there is no reduction in productivity due to a delay in current-job processing.

The Office Action acknowledges that Yoshida fails to disclose a controller that performs a), b), c) and d), above. In an attempt to remedy this deficiency, the Office Action relies on Nakamura. In particular, the Office Action refers to paragraphs [0105] and [0106] and Figs. 9A through 9E of Nakamura.

Here, Nakamura discloses a printing priority ranking determination process in which print job A is compared to print job B to determine which job will be processed first. However, as discussed during the interview, Nakamura simply discloses that the *overall print waiting time* (i.e., the sum of the waiting time for job A and waiting time for job B) of image that has been developed to bitmap data is compared to the *overall print waiting time* (i.e., the sum of the waiting time for job A and waiting time for job B) of image that has not yet been developed to bitmap data (see paragraph [0105] of Nakamura). In paragraph [0106], Nakamura simply discloses that the *overall print waiting time* can be shortened if priority rankings are assigned after bitmap development. Accordingly, Nakamura simply discloses an "**overall print waiting time**" of combined printing jobs. As discussed during the interview, there is no teaching or suggestion of processing a wait period between individual pages of a current job as defined in independent Claims 1 and 11. That is, Nakamura does not disclose a) obtaining a processing wait period between individual pages of a current job, b) obtaining the minimum processing time for the next job data, c) comparing the processing wait period between individual pages of the current job with a minimum processing time for a next job data, and d) determining whether or not the processing wait period is longer than the minimum processing time, based on a comparison between the minimum processing time for the next job data and the processing wait period between pages as recited in independent Claim 1, and similarly recited in independent Claim 11. Further, Obata fails to cure these

deficiencies of Yoshida and Nakamura. Thus, independent Claims 1 and 11 are patentable over the combination of Yoshida, Nakamura and Obata for at least the above reasons.

Independent Claim 4 recites a data processing apparatus comprising one or more compression/decompression unit(s) that compress the data for an input job and decompress the compressed data, and a controller. When a processing request is issued for processing of the data for a next job by the compression/decompression unit(s) during processing of the data for a current job by the compression/decompression unit(s), the controller performs processing comprising: a) **identifying an attribute of the next job**, b) determining whether processing of data for the next job by the compression/decompression unit(s) within the processing wait period is possible or not, **based on the identified next job attribute**, and c) controlling the execution of processing of data for the next job by the compression/decompression unit(s) **between individual pages** of the current job in accordance with this determination.

The Office Action says that Claim 4 contains substantially the same subject matter as Claim 1. However, as discussed during the interview, Claim 1 and the Office Action are both silent with regard to *identifying an attribute of the next job*, and determining whether processing of data for the next job by the compression/decompression unit(s) within the processing wait period is possible or not, *based on the identified next job attribute*. Thus, the Office Action does not provide any basis for rejecting independent Claim 4 and fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(2), which states that when a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, *the particular part relied on must be designated*.

In addition, for at least the reasons discussed above, the combination of Yoshida, Nakamura and Obata fails to disclose or suggest controlling the execution of processing of data for a next job by compression/decompression unit(s) **between individual pages** of the current job in accordance with this determination, as recited in independent Claim 4. Thus, independent Claim 4 is patentable over the combination of Yoshida, Nakamura and Obata for at least the above reasons.

Claims 2, 3, 5-10 and 12-22 are patentable over the applied references at least by virtue of their respective dependence from the patentable independent claims. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: May 3, 2011

By: /David R. Kemeny
David R. Kemeny
Registration No. 57241

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620